



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		AT	TORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/189,04	3 11/09/9	8 ROCKLAGE		5	238/117
022249 HM12/1215		┐	EXAMINER		
LYON & LYON LLP				HOLLINDEN,G	
SUITE 4700				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
633 WEST FIFTH STREET LOS ANGELES CA 90071-2066				1616	7
			DATE MAILED:	12/15/99	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application r proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

09/189,043 Art Unit 1616

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-4, 8, 20, 21, and 24, drawn to a method of detecting ischemia using magnetic resonance imaging, classified in Class 436, subclass 173.
- II. Claim 1-4, 8, 20, 22, and 24, drawn to a method of measuring the vascular effects of drugs on blood flow, classified in Class 424, subclass 9.
- III. Claims 1-4, 8, 20, and 23-24, drawn to drawn to a method of measuring the effect of surgery on blood flow, classified in Class 600, subclass 420.

Claims 1-16, 19, 20, and 24-26 are generic to two or more of the grouped inventions and as such may not properly be placed in any of the designated groups. However, they will be examined to the extent that they read upon the elected invention.

Clearly, a reference which would anticipate Group I would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious the invention(s) of Groups II and III. Further, the searches of the inventions are not co-extensive, particularly with regard to the literature search required and would constitute an undue burden for the Examiner. One skilled in the art could readily practice the invention of Group I without practicing or infringing the invention(s) of Groups II and III. Since the three method represent entirely different methods of use and as such represent independent inventions, each is capable of supporting its own patent.

Because these inventions are independent for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Claims 1-4, 8, and 20-24, drawn in Markush format, encompass multiple independent and patentably distinct inventions. Accordingly, a requirement to provisionally elect a single independent and patentably distinct species is made as provided for in MPEP § 803.02. It is noted that the claims encompass such final products as those set forth on pages 8-10.

It is considered that a Markush-type claim encompassing such species is directed to multiple independent and patentably distinct inventions since the species are so unrelated and diverse that a reference anticipating one of the species 09/189,043 Art Unit 1616

would not anticipate or render obvious the other species. Further, the species are considered to be independent since they are unrelated in operation, one does not require the other for ultimate use, and the specification does not disclose a dependent relationship between them. Moreover, each of the stated species is considered to be patentably distinct from the others on the basis of its properties. Thus, the stated species are capable of supporting separate patents under 35 USC § 121.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election. By species is meant a single compound. The compound may be named in any of four ways (or any combination thereof): 1) according to the IUPAC standard, 2) by a pictorial representation of the compound, 3) by setting forth the <u>specific</u> chemical group that <u>each</u> variable of the Markush group represents, or 4) by naming a claim or an example which itself sets forth a <u>single</u> compound.

Since the instant claims are drawn to a composition of matter which contains more than one group of compounds, a single compound (as described above) should be elected for <u>each</u> group of compounds. It is not necessary to elect a single compound for groups of compounds which are inert and have no bearing on the patentability of the composition (e.g. it would not usually be necessary to elect which solvent or buffer system the composition will be associated with). In the instant case, Applicant should elect both a chelating agent and a metal ion.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of the other invention.

In the event that the Markush-type claims are not found to be allowable, the examination of tee claims presented will be limited to the Markush-type claims to the extent that they read on the elected species and claims directed solely to the elected species. The claims directed solely to the non-elected species will be held withdrawn from consideration. A requirement to elect a species has been held to be tantamount to a requirement for restriction under $35\,\mathrm{USC}~\S~121^1$.

The processing of this application can be expedited by providing the following information or changes in your next amendment:

- Proper cross-reference to related applications for which priority is claimed under 35 U.S.C. § 120 in the first paragraph of the specification including current status (M.P.E.P. 201.11)
- Early filing of an Information Disclosure Statement that includes a PTO-1449 form wherein the document number, publication date, inventor, country of publication, and US patent classification is listed for each patent document and wherein the author, title, journal, volume, issue (if known), pages, and year of publication is listed for all journal references (M.P.E.P. 609). A timely prior art disclosure by the Applicant aids in a speedy prosecution and helps to insure that the patent granted is both valid and enforceable.
- A descriptive title (M.P.E.P. 606 and 606.01). Please note that 1-2 word titles are generally unacceptable.
- Ensuring that each of the drawings presented (if any) are described in the brief description of the drawings. Please note that if a drawing has more than one figure in it (e.g. Figures 1A and 1B), each of the figures must be individually described.
- An abstract which is descriptive of the disclosed invention and contains the chemical structure of the active ingredient(s).
- Correction of any ambiguities in the specification which may lead to a printer inquiry, such as blank spaces which appear to be omissions.
- Correction of any typographical errors in the application.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to the Group 1600 fax machine at 703/308-4556. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30; November 15 1989.

Any inquiry concerning this Office Action or any earlier Office Actions in this application should be directed to Dr. Gary E. Hollinden whose telephone number is 703/308-4521. Dr. Hollinden's office hours are from 6:30 am to 3:00 pm on Monday through Friday.

¹In re Herrick, 115 USPQ 412, Comm'r Pat. 1957; In re Joyce, 115 USPQ 412, Comm'r Pat. 1957.

Art Unit 1616

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703/308-1235.

Gary E. Hollinden, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner Group 1600